



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,349	02/24/2004	Antoine LaFont	S63.2-9776US02	8749
490	7590	08/01/2006		EXAMINER
		VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A.		SCHILLINGER, ANN M
		6109 BLUE CIRCLE DRIVE		
		SUITE 2000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		MINNETONKA, MN 55343-9185		3738

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/785,349	LAFONT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ann Schillinger	3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 9-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 17, 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mikus et al. (U.S. Application No. 2002/0035391). Mikus et al. discloses all of the following regarding claim 1: a method of treating a bodily vessel comprising the steps of (pg. 2, paragraph 0024): inserting a catheter having a distal portion into a body vessel, the distal portion having an expandable region, an expandable stent being disposed about at least a portion of the expandable region; advancing the distal portion to a desired location in a bodily vessel; delivering the stent to the desired location by expanding the

expandable region from an unexpanded diameter to an expanded diameter (pg. 2, paragraph 0025); delivering heat to the stent during the expansion of the expandable region (pg. 3, paragraphs 0031 and 0036).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 6, and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikus et al. in view of Boylan et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0187497). Mikus et al. does not disclose a stent that is at least partially constructed of stainless steel. Boylan et al., teaches the following regarding claim 2: the stent is at least partially constructed of stainless steel (pg. 1, paragraph 0007).

Regarding claim 6, Mikus et al. discloses the following: a method of treating a bodily vessel comprising the steps of (pg. 2, paragraph 0024): advancing a stent delivery catheter comprising a stent disposed about at least a portion of an expandable region to a desired location in a bodily vessel; delivering the stent in the bodily vessel at the desired location (pg. 2, paragraph 0025); and heating the stent during delivery (pg. 3, paragraph 0031 and 0036). Mikus et al. does not disclose the use of stainless steel to construct the catheter, but Boylan et al. teaches the following: constructed substantially of stainless steel (pg. 1, paragraph 0007) for the purpose of opening and maintaining the patency of the body lumen.

Regarding claim 7, Mikus teaches the following: the stent is conductively heated by directing energy to the stent through a portion of the catheter (pg. 3, paragraph 0031 and 0036).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the initial stent of the Mikus et al. reference in order to permanently deform the stent and hold open and maintain the patency of the body lumen.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikus et al. in view of Guglielmi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,995). Mikus et al does not disclose the use of heated contrast agent, but '995 teaches the following regarding claims 4 and 5: the expanded region is expanded by delivering a heated contrast agent to the expandable region; a heated contrast agent is delivered to the distal portion as the stent is delivered (col. 13, lines 28-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a contrast agent because it would allow for observance of the expansion of the stent and the behavior of the vessel wall.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikus et al. in view of Boylan et al. and in further view of Guglielmi et al. Mikus et al. and Boylan et al. do not explicitly disclose that the bodily vessel will also be heated when the stent is heated. However, '995 teaches the following: the bodily vessel is heated by the stent (col. 2, lines 1-7 and 25-26), which would prevent restenosis.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on January 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant contends that Mikus et al. does not teach an "expandable stent being disposed about at least a portion of the expandable region." However, Figures 6 and 7 in Mikus et al. discloses the stent being disposed about at least a portion of the expandable region. With this disclosure in Mikus et al., the additions of Boylan et al. and Guglielmi et al. are adequate to address the elements not taught by Mikus et al.

Regarding the word "about," the argument filed by the Applicant's representative is insufficient to overcome the rejection made on the independent claims. The term "about" has been interpreted broadly and does not provide any indication as to what range of specific activity is covered.

The Examiner has interpreted the word "about" broadly. In the Merriam-Webster Dictionary the broadest meaning of the word "about" is the following: "...reasonably close to..." "...in the vicinity..." etc. For the above reasons, the Examiner maintains the previous rejection.

In order to overcome the rejection, the Applicant's representative can substitute the word "about" by the word "above."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Schillinger whose telephone number is (571) 272-6652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571)272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ann Schillinger
July 17, 2006

A. Stewart
ALVIN J. STEWART
PRIMARY EXAMINER